II. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These Remarks are in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 20, 2005. No fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

Claims 1-15 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Final Office Action. The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-15. The present reply contests the rejections, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-15. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yeo (U.S. Patent 6,711,741 [hereafter, "*Yeo*"]), Claims 2, 4, 6-9, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yeo* in view of Ceccarelli (U.S. Patent 6,222,532 [hereafter, "*Ceccarelli*"]), *Yeo* and *Ceccarelli*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of amended claim 1.

Independent claims 1, 10, and 15 were rejected as anticipated by *Yeo*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Regarding claim 1, the Final Office Action suggests (p. 4, section 3, para. 2) that in *Yeo*, "[t]he claimed step of indexing at least one point of the look-x data stream to at least one corresponding point in the data flow is met by the relation between the temporal snapshots and the continuous video frames. Column 4, lines 52-58 teach a relation between the snapshots and the continuous video…" Similarly, regarding claim 10, the Final Office Action suggests (p. 5, last para.--p. 6, 1st para.) that in *Yeo*, "[t]he claimed controller for indexing at least one point of the look-x data stream to a corresponding at least one point in the data flow is met by the relation between the temporal snapshots and the continuous video frames. Column 4, lines 52-58 teach a relation between the snapshots and the continuous video…" Finally, regarding claim 15, the Final Office Action suggests (p. 7, 1st para.) that in *Yeo*, "[t]he claimed step of in response to the first connection, generating a new index, the new index relating at least one point of the look-x data stream to at least one corresponding point in said data flow is met by the relation between the temporal snapshots and the continuous video frames, more specifically the client control sub-system 308, which generates the index…" These points are stated again in the Response to Arguments on pages 2-3 of the Final Office Action.

However, in regard to all three claims, the referenced lines of *Yeo* teach that a user can select from an image in an application window through some input device. The referenced lines of *Yeo*

5

further teach that the user selection signals display organizer 508 to request for image 608's corresponding segment of source video frames 106 from server 100. The Final Office Action further suggests that these limitations of claim 1 are more specifically taught by *Yeo* at col. 4, lines 4-9. However, the referenced lines of *Yeo* disclose that in one particular scenario, when a display application requests to playback a particular segment of video source frames, client control subsystem 308 responds to display application's request by notifying server through signal path 326 and network interface. The Office Action appears to be improperly conflating two separate concepts-- the *relation* between the *precomputed* temporal snapshots and the continuous video frames as taught by *Yeo*, and indexing as taught in the current claims, i.e., computing *on the fly individual points in time* of the video sequence that have some significance.

Applicant respectfully notes that neither of these passages makes the disclosure contained in claim 1, which teaches indexing at least one point of the look-x data stream to at least one corresponding point in the data flow. Applicant respectfully further notes that neither of these passages makes the disclosure contained in claim 10, which teaches a controller for indexing at least one point of the look-x data stream to a corresponding at least one point in the data flow indexing at least one point of the look-x data stream to at least one corresponding point in said data flow. Applicant respectfully notes that neither of these passages makes the disclosure contained in claim 15, which teaches in response to opening the first connection, generating a new index, the new index relating at least one point of the look-x data stream to at least one corresponding point in said data flow. Despite the repeated suggestion otherwise, Applicant respectfully notes that *Yeo* contains no teaching regarding generating an index from the second connection.

Claims 1, 10, and 15 recite embodiments of a general method for indexing *previously unindexed* data content. An index is generated from the forward content that is then used to navigate through the content. This method is highly advantageous as it allows the navigation of content that is not previously indexed.

Yeo discloses a system that transmits *previously indexed* media content alongside existing media streams to enable user navigation. *Yeo* fails to disclose the features of the claimed invention. Specifically, *Yeo* fails to disclose or suggest the step of generating an index from the second connection. The second connection, namely the cited data path 322 includes *previously generated* index values that are used to for navigation. The disclosed feature of *Yeo* merely utilizes an existing

6

index; it does not generate a new index. Nowhere does *Yeo* disclose the creation of the correspondence between the keyframes and their corresponding locations. The approach of *Yeo* is vastly inferior to the claimed invention as it only allows navigation of previously indexed content.

The references cited in the Office Action, including *Yeo* and *Ceccarelli*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 10, and 15. Amended claims 2-9 and 11-14 each ultimately depend from one of the independent claims and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Accordingly, claims 1-15 are believed patentable over the cited references and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims, as amended in the subject patent application, should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of the patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/20/05   By: J. Steven Svoboda
                                       Registration No. 44,366

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
e-mail: jss@fdml.com

7

U.S. Application No. 09/738,905
Attorney Docket No.: FXPL-01009US0 MCF/JSS
SSvoboda/FXPL/1009us0/Reply B as filed.doc